

## REMARKS


Claim was objected to as lacking proper antecedent basis. In response, the applicants have amended Claim 2 to remedy this deficiency. Claim 16 was objected to as being indefinite under 35 USC 112. Claim 16 has been cancelled, so this objection is moot. It is believed that the foregoing amendments have corrected the informalities in the claims.

Rejected Claim 16 was cancelled. Claim 2 was amended to be allowable. The allowance of Claims 1 and 3-15 is gratefully acknowledged by the applicants. Therefore, Claims 1-15 are patentable.

It should be noted that the foregoing changes were made to further prosecution of the patent application. No admission is made that the rejected claims 16 is obvious in view of Schapire and Pudil.

In summary, it is believed that the foregoing amendments have placed Claims 1-15 in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims at an early date is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Katrina A. Lyon

Registration No. 42,821

Attorney for Applicants

LYON & HARR, LLP  
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 800  
Oxnard, CA 93036  
(805) 278-8855